



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,701	08/05/2003	Douglas A. Wood	RSW920030050US1	7561
43168	7590	10/05/2007	EXAMINER	
MARCIA L. DOUBET LAW FIRM PO BOX 422859 KISSIMMEE, FL 34742			RADTKE, MARK A	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2165				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/05/2007		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mld@mindspring.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/634,701	WOOD, DOUGLAS A.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mark A. X Radtke	2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20030805.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 5 August 2003 has been considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 7-10 are objected to for a minor informality. Claims 7 and 9 depend from claim 5, but claim 6 was placed between them even though claim 6 depends from claim 4. A series of singular dependent claims is permissible in which a dependent claim refers to a preceding claim which, in turn, refers to another preceding claim. A claim which depends from a dependent claim should not be separated by any claim which does not also depend from said dependent claim. It should be kept in mind that a dependent claim may refer to any preceding independent claim. In general, applicant's sequence will not be changed. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-6 and 8-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by RDF Syntax ("Resource Description Framework (RDF) Model and Syntax Specification" by W3C, 8 October 1998. Available online at <http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/article/lassila98resource.html>).

As to claim 1, RDF Syntax teaches a method of uniquely identifying resources (see section 1, "Introduction"), comprising steps of:

modeling the resources using a hierarchical schema, wherein classes in the schema correspond to resource types (see section 1, paragraph 5, line 4, "Classes are organized in a hierarchy") and wherein instances in the schema represent individual resources, each instance being associated with one of the classes according to the resource type of the individual resource represented by the instance (see section 2.1, paragraph 1, last sentence, "resources correspond to objects and properties correspond to instance variables"); and

defining, at a topmost class of the hierarchical schema, a naming rule property and an instance identity property (see section 2.2., paragraph 2, "XML rules"), wherein:

each class at levels of the hierarchical schema beneath the topmost level inherits the naming rule property and the instance identity property (see section 1, paragraph 5);

a value of the naming rule property for a selected class identifies properties of the selected class that enable instances of the selected class to have unique identities (see section 2.1.1, below figure 2); and an instance of the selected class specifies the unique identity for that instance, using the identified properties for the selected class (see section 1, paragraph 5).

As to claim 2, RDF Syntax teaches further comprising the steps of: creating an identity for a particular one of the resources, using the naming rule for the class with which a particular instance that represents the particular resource is associated; and storing the created identity as the value of the instance identity property for the particular instance (see section 2.2, Basic RDF Syntax).

As to claim 3, RDF Syntax teaches further comprising the step of locating a particular instance that represents a particular resource using the value of the instance's identity property (see section 6, Formal Grammar for RDF).

As to claim 4, RDF Syntax teaches wherein the value of the instance identity property for a selected one of the instances comprises a local identity (see section 6, number 1, "p is the expansion of the namespace-qualified tag name...").

As to claim 5, RDF Syntax teaches wherein the local identity comprises a class name for the class with which the instance is associated and one or more name/value pairs, wherein each name/value pair comprises a property name and a value for that property name, using property names specified as the value of the naming rule property for the class (see section 6, number 1).

As to claim 6, RDF Syntax teaches wherein the value of the instance identity further comprises an identification of a scoping context that is required to provide uniqueness of the instance identity value (see section 2.2.1).

As to claim 9, RDF Syntax teaches wherein the value of the instance identity further comprises an identification of a root scope within which the particular resource is unique (see section 2.2.1, page 2, "namespace").

As to claim 10, RDF Syntax teaches wherein the identification of the root scope comprises a domain name within which the particular resource is located (see section 2.2.1, page 2, where "domain name" is read on "description.org").

As to claim 11, RDF Syntax teaches wherein the value of the naming rule property is specified using a structured document (See section 2.2. XML is a structured document format).

As to claim 12, RDF Syntax teaches wherein the value of the naming rule property is specified using a structured markup language (See section 2.2. XML is a structured markup language).

As to claim 13, RDF Syntax teaches wherein the hierarchical schema is an object-oriented schema (see section 1, paragraph 5).

As to claim 14, RDF Syntax teaches further comprising the step of creating an identity for a particular one of the resources, using the naming rule for the class with which a particular instance that represents the particular resource is associated (see section 2.1, "Resources").

As to claim 15, RDF Syntax teaches a system for uniquely identifying resources (see section 1), comprising:

means for overriding the value of the naming rule property at any of the levels of the hierarchical schema beneath the topmost level (see section 7.3 and see section 3).

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

As to claim 16, RDF Syntax teaches a computer program product for uniquely identifying resources (see section 1), the computer program product embodied on one or more computer-readable media and comprising:

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 15 above.

As to claim 17, RDF Syntax teaches a method of generating unique resource identities (see section 1), comprising steps of:

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over RDF Syntax as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of RDF Schema ("RDF Vocabulary Description Language 1.0: RDF Schema" by W3C).

As to claim 7, RDF Syntax teaches wherein:

the value of the instance identity further comprises an identification of a scoping context that is required to provide uniqueness of the instance identity value (see Examiner's comments regarding claim 7); and

RDF Syntax does not explicitly teach wherein the identification of the scoping context comprises a scoping class name that identifies a selected one of the classes, wherein the particular resource is unique within the selected class, along with one or more name/value pairs, wherein each name/value pair comprises a scoping class property name and a value for that scoping class property name, wherein the scoping class property names are specified as the value of the naming rule property for the scoping class.

RDF Schema teaches wherein the identification of the scoping context comprises a scoping class name that identifies a selected one of the classes, wherein the particular resource is unique within the selected class, along with one or more name/value pairs, wherein each name/value pair comprises a scoping class property name and a value for that scoping class property name, wherein the scoping class property names are specified as the value of the naming rule property for the scoping class (see page 10, "rdfs:range").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time the invention was made to have modified RDF Syntax by the teaching of RDF Schema because "[RDF Syntax] does not address how the characteristics of properties are expressed; for such information, refer to the RDF Schema specification." The two documents describe the same technology and are intended to complement each other. Each one makes numerous references to the other.

As to claim 8, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein the scoping class name is identified in the value of the naming rule property for the class with which the instance is associated (see RDF Schema, page 10, "rdfs:range", "The value of an rdfs:range property is always a Class").

Additional References

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to RDF in general:

<u>Doc. No.</u>	<u>Assigned to</u>
US 6654759 B1	Brunet; Alain et al.
US 6983288 B1	Kirkwood; Michael J. et al.
US 20040158575 A1	Jacquemot, Christian et al.

"Information Resources Management in Heterogeneous, Distributed Environments: A Metadatabase Approach" by Hsu et al.

"The Semantic Web: The Roles of XML and RDF" by Decker et al.

"Resource Management through Multilateral Matchmaking" by Raman et al.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the examiner, Mark A. Radtke. The examiner's telephone number is (571) 272-7163, and the examiner can normally be reached between 9 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to contact the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin, can be reached at (571) 272-4146.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Customer Service at (800) 786-9199.

maxr

30 September 2007



JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100